

REMARKS

The final Office Action of September 23, 2009, rejects all pending claims 1-20. No claim amendments are included in this After-Final Reply. As such, claims 1-20 remain pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all pending claims in view of the remarks set forth below.

Interview Summary

Through the undersigned representative, Applicants conducted an interview with the Examiner on November 16, 2009. The interview generally pertained to independent claim 1 and the U.S. Publication No. 2002/0091709 to Jung ("the Jung reference"). In particular, Applicants argued that the Jung reference does not disclose or suggest "(i) detects a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute," as recited in Applicants' independent claims. The Examiner agreed with applicants' interpretation of the Jung reference as not disclosing or suggesting such a feature. The Examiner noted several times that the present claims appeared to be in condition for allowance and encouraged Applicants to submit the present after-final response to articulate the differences from the references of record.

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-10, 14-15, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,342,907 to Petty, et al. ("the Petty reference") in view of the Jung reference. The Office Action also rejects claims 11-13, 16-17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Petty reference in view of the Jung reference and further in view of <http://www.devdaily.com/java/edu/vc/vc010003> ("the DevDaily.com reference"). Claims 1, 14, and 18 are independent.

Applicants' independent claims are patentable over the cited references because the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all of the claimed features. For example, Jung does disclose that patterns of non-input fields can be detected using delimiters. (*See* Jung at [0044] and FIG. 6). The Jung reference states that "the user may enter delimiters before or behind each word or phrase corresponding to a respective data field, such as 'date,' 'time,' 'location,' 'agenda,' and so forth." (*Id.* at [0044]). But this passage of Jung does not disclose that, as per the present subject matter, a pattern should be detected of an input field located next to a non-input field. It was therefore agreed in the interview that Jung does not disclose or suggest the feature "(i) detects a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute," as recited in Applicants' independent claims (emphasis added).

As conceded in the Office Action at page 4, the Petty reference does not disclose or suggest such a feature, and Applicants agree with this position.

It follows that neither Jung nor Petty, nor the proposed combination of them, discloses the present claim feature mentioned above.

The DevDaily.com reference does not provide the subject matter that is missing from the Petty reference and the Jung reference, and the Examiner did not contend so either. The DevDaily.com reference is directed to creating a Tab Panel using Visual Café. (*See* DevDaily.com at Introduction). The DevDaily.com reference appears to be relied upon in the Office Action for another feature and does not disclose "detect[ing] a pattern among the field attributes in the first configuration table, the detected pattern comprising a first field attribute corresponding to an input field that is located on a common row and next to a non-input field corresponding to a second field attribute," as recited in Applicants' independent claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants' independent claims are patentable over the cited references, as the Examiner acknowledged in the interview. As such, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner remove the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of independent claims 1, 14, and 18, as well as claims 2-13, 15-17, and 19-20, which depend either directly or indirectly from one of the independent claims.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fee is believed due. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2009 _____

/s/ J. Richard Soderberg reg. no. 43,352/ _____
J. Richard Soderberg
Reg. No. 43,352

Fish & Richardson P.C.
3200 RBC Plaza
60 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Telephone: (612) 335-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945